## **REMARKS**

In the Final Rejection [paper no. 5] the Examiner rejected the claims 1-20 as unpatentable under § 103 over Bleasdale (U.S. 3,882,770). Specifically, the Examiner has found the claims unpatentable over Bleasdale in view of the Applicants' application specification. While Applicants maintain that this is an improper rejection, Applicants have amended the claims in order to expedite the allowance of the claims.

Prior to entry of this amendment, claims 1-20 are pending. Claims 1, 12 and 17 are independent claims. Applicants have cancelled claims 6 and 13 and have amended claims 1, 12 and 17 to include a timer set to a predetermined period of time such that when shredded material interrupts the beam for a period longer than the predetermined period of time, the cutting device, or comminuting device, is deactivated. Bleasdale nowhere discloses or suggests a timer that is set to a predetermined period of time such that when shredded material interrupts the beam for a period longer than the predetermined period of time the cutting device is deactivated. Instead, Bleasdale discloses circuitry that allows the shredder motor to be deenergized as soon as the beam of light associated with the photo-sensitive device is interrupted (see, e.g. Bleasdale, col. 2:29-41).

Thus, Bleasdale does not render the claims obvious. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn and that pending claims 1-5, 7-12 and 14-20 be allowed.

## **CONCLUSION**

In conclusion, Applicants respectfully submit that pending claims 1-5, 7-12 and 14-20 are allowable in their present form, and hereby request allowance of claims 1-5, 7-12 and 14-20. If any questions arise or issues remain, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number listed below in order to expedite disposition of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Anastasia Heffner

Registration No. 47,638

Attorney for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE P.O. BOX 10395 CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610 (312) 321-4200